DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 506 24 TE 499 926

By-Mehlinger, Howard D.
The Study of American Political Behavior. An Occasional Paper.
Indiana Univ., Bloomington. High School Curriculum Center in Government.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0643
Pub Date Dec 67
Contract-OEC-6-10-274
Note-77p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
Descriptors-*American Government (Course), *Civics, Course Evaluation, Course Objectives, Course Organization, Curriculum Design, *Curriculum Development, Experimental Curriculum, Government Role, Political Issues, *Political Science, Secondary Education, Social Sciences, *Social Studies, Social Systems

This progress report, issued by the Indiana University High School Curriculum Center in Government, attempts to make clear the Center's position on certain issues in social studies curriculum development and the rationale behind these positions. The paper's first section considers complaints about present government courses and examines existing assumptions regarding (1) the process by which American youngsters are socialized into the political culture, (2) the role in political education of high school civics and government courses, (3) the purposes and goals of experimental curriculum development projects in government, and (4) the selection of specific course content. The second section, "A Course in American Political Behavior," describes the essential characteristics of an experimental two-semester course in civics and government: the structure of the discipline, the concepts and values of the course, and the inquiry skills to be developed in the students. The actual course is still under development. (MP)

ED031506

BR-5-0643
PA-24
OE-BR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE STUDY OF AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Howard D. Mehlinger

An Occasional Paper from the High School
Curriculum Center in Government
Indiana University

December, 1967

TE 499 926

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper was prepared under the auspices of the High School Curriculum Center in Government at Indiana University. The Center is sponsored by the School of Education and the Department of Government. Its Executive Committee consists of three representatives from the Department of Government -- Mr. Byrum Carter, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Mr. Alfred Diamant, Professor of Government; and Mr. William Siffin, Professor of Government -- and two representatives from the School of Education -- Mr. Shirley Engle, Associate Dean for Advanced Studies; and Mr. Frederick Smith, Associate Professor of Education. Dean Engle is Chairman of the Executive Committee. The Director of the Center is Mr. Howard Mehlinger, Assistant Professor of History. Mr. John Patrick, Research Associate; Mr. Eugene Michaels, research assistant for audio-visual production; Mrs. Jane Lewis, secretary; and Mrs. Patricia Street, clerk-typist, complete the Center staff.

This paper, together with other publications of the Center, is part of Project No. H-223 supported by a contract between the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Indiana University Foundation by authority of P.L. 81-152, Title III, Section 302 (c) (15) and P.L. 83-531.

CONTENTS

SECTION I: A RATIONALE FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT. 1

Some Basic Operating Assumptions 4

Some Complaints About Existing Courses 9

Assumptions Based upon Research into Political Socialization 12

Assumptions About the Role of High School Courses in Civics and Government. 18

Some Assumptions about the Nature of Experimental, Curriculum Development Projects. 20

Courses not units 23

Assumptions Underlying Our Specific Choices of Courses 25

SECTION II: A COURSE IN AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR. 31

Goals for Civic Education. 32

General Description of the Course. 39

Some Essential Characteristics of the Course in American Political Behavior 43

Structure of a Discipline 43

Concepts. 46

Inquiry 54

Values. 63

Pilot Trials and Evaluation of Project Materials 66

In Conclusion. 71

SECTION I: A RATIONALE FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT

Harold Berlak and Alan Tom recently castigated many of the directors of social studies curriculum development projects for having failed to abide by the normal canons of "scholarly and professional activity."[1] Berlak and Tom charged that directors of experimental projects engaged in research and development in the social studies have the same responsibility to report their hypotheses, the procedures for testing their hypotheses, and the results of their research determined on the basis of a rigorous and systematic evaluation as do scholars engaged in other types of research. Unfortunately, according to the authors, many project directors view their tasks more as publication ventures than as research and development projects.

Of course, these charges do not apply to the directors of all social studies projects. Moreover, the charges are not completely fair. A few project directors have established newsletters to keep others informed of their work; at least one project director has written a book setting forth his assumptions and reporting the results of his investigation. In published articles, in speeches, and within the curriculum materials themselves, project directors have, in part at least, made clear many of the assumptions that influence their work. Furthermore, it is easy to understand why systematic progress reports by the projects are scarce. The majority of the projects are operated by two or three people who are limited by very small budgets; they are reluctant to take time and resources away from course development to write periodic reports on their progress. Moreover, the social studies is such a backward culture that in an age of radar-controlled navigation many project directors are flying "by the seats of their pants." They hesitate to report hypotheses that may be discarded once they have materials ready for tryout in the schools. One project director has spoken for many when he indicated that while his project began with certain assumptions, many of these assumptions had to be revised and new ones added as the staff acquired experience and the project became more sophisticated.[2] Fortunately or unfortunately, course development does not seem to take place in exact accordance with theory. Participating in a curriculum development project is a learning experience, and it would be a narrow-minded staff that did not profit from it.

---

[1] Berlak, Harold and Tom, Alan. "Toward Rational Curriculum Decisions in the Social Studies." Indiana Social Studies Quarterly. Vol. XX, No. 2 (Autumn, 1967) pp. 29-30.

Nevertheless, in principle, Berlak and Tom are correct. It is remarkable that during a time when there is so much frenetic activity to revise courses in social studies, there is so little debate about the assumptions upon which these courses are being constructed. This debate has undoubtedly suffered from the lack of exposure to contending points of view.

This paper is an attempt to add fuel to a debate that cannot help but assist all of us who are seeking to improve the teaching of social studies through curriculum research and development. In part, it is prompted by the belief that some type of periodic report to attentive members of the profession is one of the requirements of a research and development project. In the absence of resources that would enable us to establish a regular newsletter, we have elected to publish occasional papers reporting on our work.

Our first "occasional paper," although it did not appear under that title, was entitled Political Socialization of American Youth: A Review of Research with Implications for Secondary School Social Studies. This paper by John J. Patrick, Research Associate for our Center, was designed initially as an internal paper for the use of the Center. Later, we elected to distribute the paper in mimeograph form on request to any who might request it.

---

[2] Fenton, Edwin. "Edwin Fenton Replies." Social Education, Vol. XXXI, No. 7. (November, 1967) p. 581.

Nearly a thousand mimeograph copies were distributed before our supply was exhausted.[3]

The current "occasional paper" attempts to lay bare some assumptions that direct the activities of one group of course developers. Certain assumptions undergird all our activities. They are reported in section one of this paper. Other assumptions are more specific to a course entitled American Political Behavior currently under development and intended for use with ninth-grade students. These assumptions are recorded in the second section of this paper.

This "occasional paper" is not an attempt to summarize the research of others, to provide a survey of possible approaches to the study of politics, or to prescribe content. It is highly subjective and impressionistic. It is a report of the biases, prejudices, and hypotheses that have led us to make certain choices about course development in the social studies. Quite different choices could have been made and are being made by others. I will try to explain why we made the ones we did. The purpose of the paper is to make clear to readers where we stand on certain issues that are of current importance in social studies curriculum development. In fulfilling this purpose, I have sometimes contrasted our decisions with those made by others. My purpose was not polemical but through comparison and contrast to make our position more clear.

Therefore, this paper may be viewed as a kind of Center progress report, particularly relating to one course currently under development. The course materials themselves and a report of the evaluation of field trials will follow in due time. Undoubtedly, some of our hypotheses will be overturned when they face the harsh reality of instruction in actual ninth-grade classrooms.

---

[3] Mr. Patrick's paper is currently available from two sources. The National Council for the Social Studies has published it as a research bulletin. It is also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Bell & Howell Company, 1700 Shaw Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44112, #ED 010 835.

This occasional paper is being circulated now not only because we feel a certain obligation to make such reports occasionally, but it also represents a crafty effort on the part of a tiny group of curriculum developers to profit from the advice and council of many wise and experienced leaders in education and political science. In the absence of funds to hire many consultants to advise us, we hope that by meeting our professional obligation, the readers of this paper will feel an equal obligation to report their reactions to us. In such a way, we may have hit upon an inexpensive way to avoid disaster and to provide for basic alterations and improvements in our course prior to the onset of pilot trials.

Some Basic Operating Assumptions:

There are more than 50 major social studies curriculum development projects at loose across the country. All of the projects share some characteristics; yet, all differ from each other in important ways. Some of the ways the High School Curriculum Center in Government is like other projects, but -- more importantly -- the way it can be distinguished from other projects is the subject of this section.

All social studies curriculum development projects begin with two assumptions. First, it is assumed that social studies instruction needs improvement. Secondly, project directors assume that it is possible to improve instruction by improving the materials students use while learning. Any project director who does not hold these assumptions received his funds through fraud. Moreover, to the extent that project directors think much about it, the vast majority believe that the way to improve a teacher's performance in the classroom is to provide him with better materials and train him in the use of these materials.

Such assumptions may seem so obvious they require no supporting evidence. Nevertheless, they remain assumptions, assumptions hotly contested by others and still not proven to the satisfaction of all. Many leaders in teacher education, for example, assume something quite different. They often view the projects with suspicion, fearing that teachers are being "locked" into a curriculum. They would prefer that attention be given to teacher education, aiming at the goal of making each teacher his own course developer. Underlying these opposing assumptions is an obvious dispute over the role teachers can best play in curriculum development, a dispute that need not delay us in this essay.

Beginning with the shared goal of improving instruction in the social studies for American students and assuming that improving the social studies curriculum is an excellent -- if not the optimum -- device for bringing about needed improvement, project directors face a choice of alternative strategies. At least two are open to them. Some project directors believe it is fruitless to reform the curriculum in bits and pieces. Without some opportunity to affect the scope and sequence of the social studies, thereby enabling them to sequence ideas and skills over several years, they believe the task to be futile. As a result, some social studies projects are attempting to revise an entire sequence of courses -- e.g. K-12, 9-12, 1-6, and so on.

There are real advantages in such an approach. It is possible to eliminate many anachronisms existing in the present curriculum; more importantly, it is possible to sequence certain basic ideas and skills that the project director deems important, inserting concepts early in the sequence and then building upon and reinforcing them in subsequent courses.

While there are obvious advantages inherent in the "let's start from scratch" approach to curriculum development, significant disadvantages are also apparent. These disadvantages might be grouped under two categories: those relating to the social studies field itself and those relating to the nature of curriculum decision-making in the schools. Regarding the former, it must be acknowledged that there is no wide-spread agreement regarding how the existing scope and sequence of social studies should be altered. While many justifiably criticize the premises that support the "expanding environment" or the "spiral curriculum" models that have heavily influenced the choice of courses at given grade levels, the fact is that no satisfactory alternative has come forth. The notion that basic and fundamental ideas from the social sciences should be introduced early and subsequently elaborated upon has obvious appeal to many, but there is no agreement regarding what these fundamental ideas are, how early each can be introduced, and in what manner they are to receive elaboration. Furthermore, some reformers continue to look to the various social science disciplines for guidance in planning courses while others believe that the social studies as a discipline in its own right should set the tone for courses in social studies. Whether the social studies is a discipline or an aspiration has not even been settled.

The decision-making structure of the educational system also presents obstacles to sweeping reform in scope and sequence. First of all, some courses are mandated for certain grade levels. For example, a one-year course in American history is required for graduation in almost every high school in the United States, often as a result of state statutes. Therefore, whether curriculum reformers like it or not, certain courses, e.g. American history, are likely to be required of high school students for many years. Curriculum developers must either build around these mandated courses or run the risk that their scope and sequence cannot be adopted in some states. Moreover, a kind of eclecticism distinguishes much curriculum planning in the schools. It is surely easier to convince one teacher, or one group of teachers at a given grade level, to change a course than it is to overhaul the entire system. While the notion that each teacher should build upon what was taught in the earlier grades and prepare students for what lies ahead is preached, in practice teachers pay little attention to what their colleagues teach. Each course is taught as a discrete package of its own.

There is at least one other alternative strategy open to social studies curriculum reformers. While this strategy lacks much of the drama and appeal of starting anew, it has a number of factors operating in its favor. This approach accepts the scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum as it presently exists across the nation. It then seeks to subvert and reform existing courses in order to make them conform more to the aspirations of the curriculum developer. It assumes that much can be done within existing courses and that progress is more likely to occur by such a series of half-steps than by big leaps that require a complete alteration of the curriculum.

The Anthropology Curriculum Study Project is one manifestation of this approach. Despairing of having all schools introduce courses in anthropology and avoiding the necessity to restructure the scope and sequence of the curriculum, the curriculum developers for the ACSP surveyed existing courses in the curriculum and elected to strike through the world history course, as this course seemed most vulnerable and most susceptible to the adoption of anthropology-based materials. When they adopt ACSP materials, schools continue to teach world history; but major segments of the course assume an anthropological perspective.

The High School Curriculum Center in Government has elected to operate within the existing scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum. By definition our Center will limit its activities to the high school grades, i.e. grades nine to twelve. Furthermore, our project is directed toward improving the teaching of civics and government in the schools. We are a "discipline-centered" project, rather than a more general social studies project. Our goal is to improve those courses that bear upon the teaching of political science and government in the high school grades. Specifically, we are interested in the ninth-grade course in civics and twelfth-grade courses in American government and American problems. These courses remain the most frequently offered courses at their respective grade levels. More than 500,000 students annually study civics at the ninth grade and more than one million youngsters study American government or American problems at the twelfth grade. In short, this Center was established on the assumption that existing courses in civics and government have not enjoyed resounding success as evidenced by the reports of their critics and that a program of research and development with a disciplinary focus could achieve significant improvements in these courses.

It is important for the reader to understand that we are not seeking answers to the questions, when should government be taught? before and after what other units of instruction? and similar questions. We assume that the scope and sequence of the high school social studies curriculum will withstand the attack of reformers for many years. Much profitable work can be done by constructing alternatives to existing courses that will enable teachers to be more successful in achieving the objectives of civic education.

It should be clear that having decided upon the strategy to improve certain courses as courses, other decisions automatically follow. For example, courses must be self contained. We cannot assume that we can pick up certain ideas that have been introduced in other courses, unless there is clear evidence that all children acquire these ideas regardless of the specific courses they have studied. For example, while we can assume that all children have acquired positive feelings about the American political system by the time they reach the ninth grade -- research in political socialization confirms this -- we cannot assume that a ninth-grade child is able to discriminate between factual statements and value statements, also discouragingly evident from existing research. Therefore, unlike those developers who know the specific concepts and skills that will be taught at each grade level and can plan to build upon what was taught previously, we must develop discrete packages that assume very little about a child's formal training in political science.

Some Complaints About Existing Courses:

It was noted above that all curriculum development projects begin with assumptions about the need to improve existing courses. This is not the place to review all the literature damning courses in high school civics and government. For the reader who is surprised to learn that these courses are not viewed as a smashing success, I have suggested two recent sources one might examine to gain some impression of the range of criticism directed against these courses.[4] Incidentally, the literature defending the way civics and government courses are taught is almost non-existent.

What the reader deserves to know is what we believe are fundamental weaknesses in existing courses in civics and government and what we intend to do about them. Our views about the weaknesses of existing courses is but another set of assumptions that may or may not be valid. They are being reported here not as truths to be accepted but as assumptions that direct our efforts.

1. Courses in civics and government often lack a clear focus. The ninth-

---

[4] Political Science in the Social Studies, ed. by Donald H. Riddle and Robert S. Cleary. (Thirty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies.) Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1966, and Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, ed. by C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1967.

grade civics course is especially vulnerable to this charge. Civics, as it has evolved over the past 40 years, has been directed toward "preparing children to be responsible citizens." As citizenship, broadly construed, includes more than participation in politics, ninth-grade civics courses often include such disparate topics as consumer economics, life adjustment, occupations, health, and personal grooming.

2. Undue attention is given to the formal structures of government thereby obscuring the less formal, but no less real, aspects of politics. For example, students often study local government through the various formal structures it assumes, e.g. mayor-council, city commission, and city manager forms of government. Knowledge of the formal structure is deemed sufficient to understand how decisions are made in the community. Seldom are students introduced to the notion of "community elite" and the degree to which community elites affect political decisions at the local level. Or, students are taught the "ten steps" by which a bill becomes a law as a way for understanding the legislative process. The "ten steps" makes clear that Congress relies upon a committee system and that both houses of Congress and the President have a role to play in the passage of legislation. However, this mechanistic formula obscures many of the essential factors involved in attempts to decide social issues through legislation. For example, the "ten steps" are grossly inadequate for helping students understand the passage of Medicare legislation more than 30 years after the first Medicare bill was dropped into the "hopper."

3. Controversial issues are often avoided in civics and government classes. Many teachers ignore public issues that create anxiety locally and nationally. There are enormous pressures on both teachers and textbook publishers to play it safe. The result is that political education in

the school is often emasculated.

The schools tend to deal with political education in much the same way that they treat sex education. Presumably, children are to be given romanticized versions of the political process because they are not sufficiently mature to learn the facts of life. It is our experience that kids often learn about politics in much the same way as they learn about sex, i.e. from peer groups, casual conversations, adults, the media, etc. What they are often deprived of is learning about politics as a topic for serious, intellectual investigation.

4. Existing courses in civics and government lag far behind research in political science. Students study government in high schools today in much the same way as their fathers and mothers studied government, despite the fact that political science has experienced enormous change and growth. Concepts from recent political science rarely appear in high school instruction on civics and government. Students are denied the insights to be gained by the use of such concepts as role, status, function, socialization, political culture.

5. There is little or no effort to develop skills of inquiry in a rigorous and systematic way. This failure follows generations of interest in teaching "critical thinking," "problem solving," "reflective thinking," etc. Nevertheless, while students are urged to "study the evidence and make rational political decisions," they are given only the most primitive form of instruction in how to achieve this.

6. Civics and government courses are unsuccessful in advancing students' understanding about American political values. This weakness stems primarily from high school teachers' misconceptions about what the school's proper role toward the study of political values should be with high-school-age students. Existing courses in civics and government devote

considerable attention to the preachment of American political values. Research has indicated that the overwhelming majority of American children acquire strong, positive, supportive attitudes about their political system and nation at an early age and that most American adolescents and adults retain this generalized basic loyalty to state and nation throughout their lives. This finding suggests that high school social studies teachers do not need to be concerned mainly with inculcating loyalty to state and nation. This finding suggests that it may be very inefficient of time and effort to do so.

However, while students are constantly exposed to value assertions in their civics and government courses, they rarely have an opportunity to inquire into the meaning of these values and to consider the consequences of behaving in a manner consistent with these values. Therefore, while students are generally familiar with and committed to fundamental American values stated as abstractions, they often lack full understanding of what the operationalization of these values might mean. Moreover, students are often unaware of the subtle but powerful influence their own values play in leading them to make decisions about politics and in preventing them occasionally from making careful, rational decisions based upon empirical evidence.

7. Existing courses in civics and government are redundant for the majority of students. They often fail to add significantly to the knowledge that students have acquired earlier or that is easily accessible from sources other than the schools.

Assumptions Based upon Research into Political Socialization:

As noted above the Center has prepared and distributed a paper entitled Political Socialization of American Youth: A Review of Research With

Implications for Secondary School Social Studies. This paper was initially written by Mr. Patrick as a working paper for use by the Center staff in the preparation of new courses in civics and government. Its purpose was to review the existing research on the process by which American youngsters are socialized into the political culture. Presumably, high school courses in civics and government should be based on what children already know about politics when they reach the ninth grade. It may surprise some to know that this very simple notion has apparently eluded the majority of teachers, administrators, course developers, and textbook publishers.

This is not the paper to review research on political socialization. For those who are unfamiliar with this research and are curious about it, I recommend that you read Mr. Patrick's paper. What follows are simply some of the assumptions for curriculum development in the field of civics and government that we have made on the basis of existing political socialization research.

Many agencies in our society contribute toward making American children loyal, committed American citizens. Parents, playmates, churches, Boy Scouts, and the mass media are but a few of the sources of political information and belief that shape children's attitudes and knowledge. In fact, children would likely become loyal and more-or-less active American citizens whether the schools offered courses in civics and government or not. Furthermore, the schools would probably have to consciously undertake programs to overturn students' feelings about the American political system to prevent American youth from becoming loyal Americans. That they will not do so is obvious; that, for the most part, the schools reinforce and promote knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs consistent with the American political culture is equally clear. In so doing, the schools take their place alongside other significant agents of political socialization.

Just how important the school's role as a political socializer has become is a disputed subject. All who have studied this question stress the importance of early learning. Apparently, many of the general attitudes and values acquired by young children have political implications. Therefore, some scholars view the family as the most significant source of political socialization; others, in particular Robert Hess and Judith Torney, believe that the elementary schools may be the most significant influence on children. No investigator has said the school is without influence; opinions differ primarily on the relative influence of the schools toward fixing political attitudes, knowledge, and belief.

The question can then be asked: what aspect of the school has the most direct impact upon students' political socialization? Is it the curriculum, the teachers, playmates, school administration? Again, scholars are not agreed upon this question; but many believe that the informal "community" of the school may be more influential than the curriculum itself. In other words, when teachers permit children to assist in making classroom rules, when students are encouraged to work in committees, when they are taught to take turns, follow rules, and share both in the classroom and on the playground, they are acquiring the skills, norms, attitudes, and behavior that are valued in American society.

As noted above, it is generally recognized that early learning is very important; some scholars insist that it is crucial. David Easton and Robert Hess concluded on the basis of their research that by the time children reach high school, the "process of political socialization [has] been underway for some time and [is] nearing completion."[5] Apparently, children enter ninth grade with well-developed political attitudes and beliefs buttressed by some political knowledge. Logically, high school instruction in civics and government should build upon the base students have already acquired.

---

[5] Hess, Robert D., and Easton, David. "Role of the Elementary School in Political Socialization," School Review, Vol. 70, 1962, pp. 258-259.

While there is conflicting evidence about the exact contribution offered by high school courses in civics and government to the political education of adolescents, the general impression derived from existing research cannot help but cause anguish to high school teachers of these subjects. The results of one, recent study have had a significant influence on our thinking. Among the advantages of this study are: it is relatively recent -- the results were reported in spring, 1967; it was conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, under the direction of Kenneth Langton and M. Kent Jennings -- two men and an institution with excellent reputations for conducting surveys of this type; and the study was based upon a national probability sample involving 1,669 high school seniors distributed among 97 secondary schools.[6]

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which courses in high school, interpreted to be grades ten to twelve, contribute to the political knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of high school seniors. Students were asked whether they had formal instruction in courses relating to civics and government in grades ten to twelve. Thirty-two per cent of the students had taken no course relating to civics and government during those three years; fifty-nine per cent had taken one course; and nine per cent had taken two or more courses. Of those students who had taken courses relating to civics and government, sixty-seven per cent had taken a course in American Government, thirty-seven per cent had taken a course in American Problems, and ten per cent had taken some other course. The fact that this totals more than 100% indicates that some students had studied both American Government and some other course relating to civics and government.

---

[6] Langton, Kenneth P., and Jennings, M. Kent. Political Socialization and the High School Curriculum in the United States. (Unpublished paper) May, 1967

Langton and Jennings sought to discriminate the course-takers from the non-course-takers according to the following criteria:

1. Political knowledge and sophistication. (Do students have knowledge about current political events and personalities?)
2. Political interest. (Do students express an interest in political affairs?)
3. Spectator politicization. (Do students read newspapers, watch news on television, etc.?)
4. Political discourse. (Do students discuss politics with their peers?)
5. Political efficacy. (Do students believe that they can influence civic affairs?)
6. Political cynicism. (Are students cynical and mistrustful of government?)
7. Civic tolerance. (Do students support the basic principles contained in the "Bill of Rights," etc.?)
8. Participative orientation. (Do students indicate that they look forward to and expect to participate in public affairs?)

These criteria were chosen because they represent objectives most often stated by curriculum directors, government teachers, and authors of civics and government textbooks. In effect, the researchers used the goals most often stated by teachers themselves to learn if existing high school courses were successful.

Langton and Jennings learned that students taking American Government and those taking American Problems courses are "virtually indistinguishable in terms of their political orientations." The differences were so slight that it was possible to treat the American Problems and American Government students alike in the experiment and to consider those who had taken courses as a group against those who had not taken courses. But their most significant conclusion was that despite teachers' hopes and aspirations, high school courses in civics and government had little influence on the students' political attitudes, values, beliefs, and knowledge. The importance of civic education courses in the senior high school are vindicated by this study, only if one uses the direction of gain. But the magnitude of gain is impressively weak, even bordering on the trivial. This should be a shocking revelation to most high school teachers of civics and government.

There is an important exception to the general conclusion stated above. A sub-group in the sample did show striking gain. This sub-group consisted of American Negroes. The amount of political knowledge they acquired and the feeling of political efficacy they gained as a result of the course were sharply upward, bringing them much more in line with white students as compared to the gap that existed between Negro students and white students who had not taken courses in civics and government. Nevertheless, white students remained more sophisticated politically than Negroes, when both groups had studied civics and government.

Perhaps, there is more than one explanation for the ineffectiveness of high school civics and government courses, but Jennings' hypothesis, one with which we agree, is that existing courses in civics and government are essentially redundant; they merely provide an additional layer of information already familiar to high school students. We know that the typical American student acquires much of his political knowledge and fixes many of his political attitudes and beliefs early in childhood. Existing high school civics and government courses do little more than provide reinforcement for most white students. For Negro children, the situation is often quite different. Many have had less opportunity to acquire similar political attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge at home; many have had less exposure to the mass media and fewer opportunities to acquire certain types of political information from peer groups. Therefore, taking a course in civics and government opens up an entirely new field of knowledge for many Negro students, one they had not experienced previously.

One might conclude from this study that schools would be justified in abolishing courses in civics and government, except perhaps for Negro youngsters. This conclusion might be supported, if the civic education goals that American society has long upheld were being realized. But, the fact is that political participation in American life is not high; political cynicism is all too prevalent; civic tolerance is far less than is desired; many citizens have a poor sense of political efficacy. Many studies have shown that adults lack knowledge about the political process and about current and historical political events. Therefore, while existing courses in civics and government apparently contribute little to furthering progress toward stated goals in civic education, our record of achievement in meeting these goals demands that we try to do better.

Assumptions About the Role of High School Courses in Civics and Government:

If most children already have well-developed political attitudes, values, and beliefs by the time they reach the high school grades, it appears wasteful for teachers to preach about American values, attitudes, and beliefs in their courses. Their students already hold these beliefs, and whatever reinforcement is necessary can be accomplished informally within the total society.

Research also makes clear that the political socialization of children occurs in society at large. Many agents contribute to adolescents' knowledge and belief about the political system. Students do not require courses in civics and government to learn that there are two major political parties in the United States, that the principal executive officer of their state is the governor, and so on. Most students know these "facts" by the time they reach high school and will have many opportunities to reinforce this knowledge throughout their lives. Yet, civics and government teachers spend an immense amount of time upon just this kind of "factual" instruction. Whenever they do so, they contribute to the redundancy of the existing courses.

Nevertheless, high school courses relating to civics and government can serve a vital role in the political education of American youth. Rather than preach values, such courses could enable students to surface their own political values, attitudes, and beliefs. By comparing their values, attitudes, and beliefs with others, students might gain insight into political culture, processes of socialization, and relationships between political attitudes and political behavior.

Moreover, rather than serving only as dispensers of information about politics and government, civics and government courses could provide an opportunity for students to acquire criteria for discriminating, evaluating, selecting, and responding to useful and relevant data from the communication flow constantly pressing in on them. In this way such courses might enable students to acquire new frequencies that would permit them to tune in on political messages that are always present for those with antenna and receivers and to unscramble these messages in order to make sense of what they are receiving. *In order to accomplish this task high school courses in civics and government must help students acquire concepts that enable them to see greater meaning in their political environment, and they must help students acquire skill in using the tools of inquiry that enable social scientists to make warranted judgments about political phenomena.*

Some Assumptions about the Nature of Experimental, Curriculum Development Projects:

We believe that certain assumptions are implied in the conduct of any experimental curriculum development project. One is that the criteria for judging the product of an experimental project are inherently different from the criteria used to judge textbooks. We are not obligated to produce a product that schools will demand, that can be published, and that will make a fortune for publishers and authors. While this must be an important consideration for commercial publishers, it is not a necessary criteria for judging experimental projects. A curriculum development project satisfies its obligations if it produces a curriculum package that has been demonstrated to have achieved its objectives and to have satisfied, at least as well as existing courses, the general objectives the schools and society have established for similar segments of the curriculum.

The attention that has been given to reforming school curricula for more than a decade, leading to the establishment of many curriculum development projects in nearly all subjects, began with a recognition of the fact that existing instructional programs were not wholly successful. The first task of a project director is a diagnostic one. After deciding why existing courses have failed, he and his staff state their assumptions clearly and begin to write new course materials that are based upon their assumptions and that are directed toward the achievement of objectives that schools believe are important to achieve within the subject area. The project may posit additional goals that have been previously ignored or accorded a minor role by the schools. It is rare that curriculum developers attempt to satisfy objectives that are contrary to those widely held in society.

High school courses in civics and government exist to satisfy civic education goals that American society deems important and believes can be met, in part at least, through formal education. There is evidence that civics and government courses are not wholly successful; some say that they have essentially failed to justify their existence. It is reasonable to believe that experimental curriculum development in this field is needed.

Nevertheless, experimental curriculum development centers are not established to write better textbooks of a kind that already exist on the market. If the failure of existing civics and government courses is only that the textbooks currently in use are poorly written -- an assumption we do not share -- it is a simple matter to repair the cause of failure. Commercial publishers need only hire better authors and improve their editing and publishing of textbooks. If, on the other hand, the principal source of failure is that an entirely new approach to the study of government is required, progress is most likely to occur through the intervention of an experimental curriculum development project.

A curious circle seems to exist. Teachers frequently criticize their civics and government books as being inadequate. When students fail to show interest in the course, a teacher often places the blame on a "dull textbook." Such teachers may be unable to explain how they would change the book, what should be added, and what sections should be deleted; but they are frequently restless with what they have. When this restlessness is communicated to publishers, they generally reply that when teachers demand a different kind of textbook, they will gladly publish it. If they were to publish books that adopt radical, new approaches to the study of government, they would likely lose money on the venture. Commercial publishers often lack sufficient risk capital to advance much ahead of the existing market.

Our curriculum development project need not prove its value by a sales record. If we can prepare a product that satisfies scholars that it represents valid, modern political science; if we can translate contemporary political science into terms adolescents can understand and manage; if teachers report that students learn successfully and seem to be highly motivated while learning; if the courses contribute successfully to the satisfaction of our goals and the majority of the objectives normally associated with civic education; and if the course *could be* adopted successfully by schools at a minimum cost and with reasonable re-training of teachers; we shall have justified the expenditure of public funds on this effort. Schools may still prefer to continue teaching civics and government as they have in the past, and publishers may ignore us. Adoption is not an obligatory or even a recommended concern for a curriculum development center.

We are engaged in the "D" of the "R and D" formula. "Development" means applied research. While research provides the source of many of our assumptions and assists in the selection of content and while we expect to design several small research studies to ascertain the consequences of the intervention of our courses upon a well-defined population, nevertheless, our day-by-day activities are more analogous to engineering than to research. We are trying to produce a product that will result in improved political education for high school students. We should be judged according to our success in "developing" or "engineering" course packages that result in improved political education for high school students.

We are trying to translate the most forward thrust of research in political science into terms adolescents can grasp. The fact that textbooks often lag far behind research in the fields they represent is well-known. The gap between what is known about politics and what is taught in high school civics and government classes is large. The enormous change that has occurred in political science during the last decade or so is scarcely, if at all, represented by the majority of high school textbooks. American children are thereby deprived of knowledge that is justly theirs.

In effect, we are writing alternative courses to existing courses in civics and government -- alternatives that could be plugged into the existing social studies curriculum with minimum disturbance for teachers of other social studies courses. While our courses are intended to fit the typical scope and sequence of the social studies, they will be different from existing civics and government courses -- different in content, different in perspective, different in pedagogical approach, different in the demands they will make on teachers and students. Despite these differences, they will hopefully contribute to a majority of the general goals widely claimed for civic education.

Courses not units. The decision to develop entire courses rather than resource units, segments of courses that could be plugged into existing courses, course guidelines, etc. all reflect another set of assumptions. Given what we know about the weaknesses of most school libraries, the limited training of most teachers in political science, and the scarcity of time teachers have for planning and preparation, we decided to build a complete course for each of two grade levels. We will write the materials required for students, provide the supporting audio-visual components the course requires, and develop an elaborate teaching guide that explains how we believe the course should be taught.

The assumptions upon which we are working are diametrically opposed to those that are used to defend resource units. Rather than suggest a variety of approaches that could be used to teach a concept and list dozens of resources that are available that might contribute to the development of the concept, we will describe one approach to be used and provide the resources that are required for it to succeed. Each course will be released only after it has been thoroughly tested in pilot classes, and we are convinced that the course will succeed, because we have polished it until it succeeds in conditions like those in our pilot classes.

Each course will be taught by members of the Center staff using classes of typically heterogeneous ninth- and twelfth-grade students. A regular day-by-day feedback and evaluation system is being designed for use in the class taught by the staff. Moreover, each course will be taught in a small number of pilot schools having students that represent a cross section of American students. The specially trained pilot teachers will report their reactions and criticisms to us on a regular basis throughout the year.

It is customary to criticize curriculum projects for "locking" teachers into a course package, thereby depriving them of the joy of teaching. No social studies course designer, no matter how able, is likely to engineer a package so perfect that it can be plugged automatically into any classroom in the country to run by itself throughout the year. Each classroom teacher must make critical decisions every day in order to make the package fit his students, his time schedule, and so on. These are decisions only individual teachers can make. Nevertheless, their decisions will be more rational if they are completely aware of what the course is to accomplish. It is impractical, even foolish, to argue that every teacher should develop his own course of study from his own resources. "New math" would never have been taught in elementary grades across the country, if it had been left to the teacher to construct his own math program.

Furthermore, teachers are involved in the development of our materials. Those who are writing the materials are experienced, high school teachers; and they will teach the experimental materials in Bloomington classes. Moreover, high school teachers are being enlisted as pilot teachers. Their opinions will be taken seriously during the trial run of each course. No course will be released until high school teachers as well as political scientists have had an opportunity to study it and to offer suggestions for its improvement.

Assumptions Underlying Our Specific Choices of Courses:

Many of the assumptions stated above have contributed to the choice of courses, but certain other factors bear more directly on the selection of course content. Among these factors are: developments in political science; stated goals of teachers at each grade level; assumptions about the needs and interests of children; and the need to deal with contemporary problems.

We are developing a two-semester ninth-grade course entitled _American Political Behavior_ and, for the twelfth grade, a one-semester course entitled _The American Political System_ and a second semester course entitled _Comparative Political Systems_, focusing on Great Britain, the USSR, and one developing nation. The ninth-grade course might be termed a micro-political approach, as the emphasis is upon the individual acting singly and in groups within the political system, while the twelfth-grade courses incorporate a macro-political perspective.

The ninth-grade course in American Political Behavior draws upon an important development in contemporary political science. Concepts and approaches contained in political behavior approaches have not become part of high school civics and government courses. Furthermore, few teachers have had training in behavioral approaches to the study of politics. Nevertheless, it is clear that many political scientists, sociologists, and others find great utility in understanding politics by using the concepts generated by the behavioral approach.

The behavioral approach enables us to satisfy many of the objectives ninth-grade teachers have for the study of civics. Teachers typically spend much time discussing the activities of citizens: how they vote, why they should vote, the importance of being informed about public issues, and so on. The behavioral approach has a particular contribution to make to the study of individuals in politics, including an enormous body of research on voter behavior.

While our principal concern was one of satisfying the goals for the ninth-grade civics course, we were aware also of some interest by schools in a relatively new course entitled Introduction to Social Science that is sometimes taught to ninth-graders and competes with the civics course. In many cases, this course is no more than a general description of the various social science disciplines. In a few cases teachers are trying to teach students the rudiments of social science inquiry.

The course in American Political Behavior is a social science course focusing on politics. Throughout the course students will be taught methods of inquiry used by social scientists to study politics. This course could be used in some schools as an Introduction to Social Science, provided that teachers were willing to limit their inquiry domain to politics.

The assumptions we have about the twelfth-grade course stem from other considerations. We recognized a need for some flexibility. American Government is taught both as a semester course and as a two-semester course across the nation. Therefore, we wished to design a course that might fit either requirement. A one-semester course on The American Political System and a second semester on Comparative Political Systems seemed to us to offer the needed flexibility.

Moreover, we were aware that a few states and a number of schools require units on "Communism." These often appear as four- to six-week units on the USSR. We believe that we can provide help to teachers by including a unit on the USSR in the semester course on Comparative Political Systems.

In addition, we felt a need to provide an entirely different perspective for twelfth-graders from that entailed by the ninth-grade course. While it may be unlikely that many students will take both the course in ninth-grade American Political Behavior and the twelfth-grade course in American and Comparative Political Systems, those who do have a right to expect that the second course will differ significantly from the first. As the ninth-grade course will focus on the individual, utilizing a micro-political approach, the twelfth-grade course is focused on the "system" and can be viewed as a macro-political approach.

The twelfth-grade courses will seek to demonstrate a consistent model or theory for looking at any political system. Attempts to construct such models presently occupy the attention of some of the best American political scientists. Their research has led them away from earlier forms of comparative approaches that focused primarily upon comparative institutions. Current research work is built largely upon structural-functional analysis. Categories of functions are identified that are satisfied by all political systems. The analysis proceeds by asking which and how various structures within a specific society perform these functions. For example, leadership recruitment is a requisite function of any political system. Scholars examine the various ways political systems recruit leaders. Enabling students to get a handle on functional categories should enable them to see more in any political system they might encounter.

The course in The American Political System will explicate the theory or model by drawing upon illustrations from American political life. Students will study American politics and government at the same time that they are gaining control of the model. The second semester will afford an opportunity for students to apply the model and analyze three other political systems -- Great Britain, the USSR, and one developing nation. Great Britain was selected to enable students to examine another system as "democratic" as their own but with quite different institutions; the USSR was selected for reasons noted above and because the USSR provides interesting contrasts to American experience; one developing nation will be included in order to show the processes of political development in a dramatic way.

It is customary to say something about the "needs and interests of the child" when planning curriculum. We assume that many of these needs and interests vary immensely with individual children and can only be provided for by the child's own teacher. Other needs and interests are characteristic of an age-group. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect curriculum designers to heed what these are.

First of all, let it be said that we are unaware of any research that documents the "needs and interests" of 13- and 17-year-old children in a way that would be of much assistance to us in selecting content for new courses in civics and government. Beyond research into political socialization that we have studied carefully, most research on children is far too general to suit our special purposes. Nevertheless, we have assumed that a child "needs" to know how his political system operates. The "needs" implied by democratic government suggest this to be true. I have observed with fascination the way children resolve conflicts and exercise power in their play. I have no reason to believe that children will not be interested in politics as it relates to conflict and exercise of power. Moreover, we recognize the importance of relating our instruction to students' own direct experience. Our exploration of American values begins by having students surface their own values and use their values as data from which inferences can be made. Many other opportunities exist throughout our courses to link general political phenomena to the children's own direct experience.

We do not believe that a student "needs" to know details about the formal structure of his local community government, a concern that typically occupies much time in civics courses. Students are too mobile for this approach to be highly functional. It is much better to have students learn aspects of political behavior that they can apply to any community rather than limit their investigation to their own. Of course, many teachers will wish to illustrate the more general political processes by drawing examples from their local community. This is to be recommended. What we are seeking to avoid is the practice of having students memorize lists of local government officials, the names of current occupants of these positions, their duties, salaries, etc. No one, certainly not high school students, "needs" to know these things nor are adolescents very interested in such data.

Most social studies specialists and classroom teachers believe that high school students should have an opportunity to inquire into problems that affect contemporary American society. A few leaders advocate building the entire social studies curriculum around the study of "crucial issues," "closed areas," and so on. Others believe that at least one course, e.g. senior American problems, should be devoted to a study of contemporary problems. One social studies curriculum development project has prepared materials for classroom instruction that focus on issues of public controversy.[7]

Whether it is best to base the selection of content on a discipline or whether it is best to focus instruction on contemporary problems is not an issue for us. Presumably, both approaches can contribute to the education of students in the social studies field. We have chosen to be a discipline-centered project. It does not follow, however, that we are uninterested in contemporary problems.

---

[7] For a description of this project, see Oliver, Donald W., and Shaver, James P. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

It is not necessary to have a problem-centered course to deal with problems. Political science has long been concerned with issues of public policy that reflect contending views, values, and aspirations. Any course in political science that overlooks these facets of politics does so at its peril. Issues relating to public policy will emerge from a study of political behavior or the political system itself and need not be elevated to a position of central focus. Throughout our courses students will be provided opportunities to investigate issues of public controversy. They shall deal with those problems that arise from the course itself, and the perspective will constantly be one of how does the political system manage such conflicts.

SECTION II: A COURSE IN AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

The ninth-grade course in American Political Behavior attempts to satisfy many of the objectives commonly claimed for ninth-grade courses in civics. Some frequently-stated civics objectives are not goals of this course. Other objectives that have either been ignored or underplayed in typical civics courses are important to us. In order to clarify these distinctions Table 1 lists typical ninth-grade civics goals in the left-hand column and our response or contribution to these goals through the American Political Behavior course in the right-hand column.

A number of points about the table should be clarified. First, if many of the ninth-grade civics goals cited in the left-hand column seem vague, they are. They were not purposely written that way. The objectives are stated as they are found in textbooks and a number of curriculum guides. The list might have been longer, as many additional goals could have been cited. We chose those that appear in a number of lists. Probably few teachers would try to accomplish all of these goals. The civics goals were categorized to suit our own purposes. They are rarely listed in this manner.

Secondly, the objectives for the course in American Political Behavior as listed in Table 1 are not sufficient to give a complete picture of the course. However, to provide individual, behavioral objectives for each day's lesson would be to reproduce the course. Therefore, the reader will have to accept the fact that we are writing more specific, daily objectives as well; but for the purpose of this paper, the contrasting list of general objectives must suffice to give the reader a picture of the ways in which our course is like and different from existing civics courses.

Finally, in stating the American Political Behavior objectives, I have used a narrative as opposed to the more typical declarative style. This was done to better discriminate our objectives from the goals stated in the left-hand column. Moreover, I have sometimes provided an example of a classroom exercise illustrating how we intend to accomplish the objective, if clarification of the goal seemed necessary.

TABLE 1
GOALS FOR CIVIC EDUCATION

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
1. Knowledge:	1. Knowledge:
a. To understand the structure of national, state, and local government.	a. While we want students to know about the structure of government, an approach to the study of politics and government that is limited to the institutions of government is too narrow in our view. The focus of our course is on individuals behaving in politics and government. Students will study the occupants of institutions as individuals performing roles. Students will examine the various strictures on role performance, including formal rules and institutional customs, that limit role behavior. Students will study political leaders in all three "levels" of government, local, state, and national, in three "branches" of government, executive, legislative, and judicial. Moreover, students will study political leaders outside the formal structure of government, e.g. community elite groups, leaders of political parties. We are primarily interested in having students understand how individuals perceive their roles in institutions and how and why they act as they do.

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
b. To learn the duties, responsibilities and privileges of citizenship in a democracy.	b. Our course focuses on individuals and how they act or behave in the American political system. Nevertheless, the categories of "duties, responsibilities, and privileges" hold little analytical utility for us. For example, is voting a duty, a responsibility, or a privilege? Students will examine voting as an act of political behavior providing one avenue to influence the political system. They shall learn why some Americans vote in every election, why some vote on occasion, and why some rarely vote. One of our major objectives is for students to acquire a reasoned and "functional" understanding of citizenship in a democracy.
c. To understand how our problems may be solved within the framework of our government.	c. We expect students to learn that the political system exists to make authoritative decisions binding on all citizens. These decisions arise as a result of a need to settle "problems." Therefore, the course centers on the ways citizens may bring pressure to bear on the system to resolve issues of concern to them.
d. To become acquainted with the political, social, and economic problems confronting our nation.	d. Issues of continuing political concern are built into the course and could scarcely be avoided. Among such issues are the conflict between majority rule and minority rights, loyalty and dissent.
e. To develop an understanding of the American system of government.	e. We expect to add to the knowledge about the American system of government that each child has already

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
	begun to acquire before he reaches the ninth grade. We intend to add to his understanding of American government in two essential ways: (1) By imposing concepts used by political scientists that will enable him to acquire increased political meaning from his experience. (See section on "concepts" following for more discussion on this point.) (2) By focusing on the largely informal, and individual behavior of American citizens. This course will not complete a student's understanding of his government. He should add to his political understanding throughout his lifetime. Nevertheless, this course will add significantly to his capacity for political understanding by providing him with concepts that enable him to make more sense of politics.
f. To learn how our form of representative government developed.	f. This objective has primarily historical implications, and we are leaving the achievement of this objective to history courses. However, in the unit on political culture, students will learn the historical sources for many of the political values and beliefs they profess as Americans.
g. To help students understand our economic system and the citizen's role in economic life.	g-j. These objectives often accompany community civics courses that contain units on occupations, consumer

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
h. To contribute to wise use of natural resources and leisure time.	economics, etc. These objectives will not be met by this course.
i. To help students make wise vocational choices in order to maximize their abilities.	
j. To contribute to better mental health.	
k. To develop an understanding of the place of the United States in the contemporary world.	k. This course does not have an international component. The focus is entirely on American political behavior. Therefore, this objective will not be achieved.
2. Cognitive Skills:	2. Cognitive Skills:
a. To develop a competence for critical thinking.	a-d. These four objectives aim essentially at the same objective. They represent an aspiration to teach youngsters how to process data in order that they can arrive at warranted judgments. Unfortunately, typical civics courses have had high hopes and low achievement regarding these goals. We, too, have high hopes and view the attainment of inquiry objectives as absolutely vital to the success of this course. How we intend to accomplish inquiry goals is specified later in the section entitled "inquiry." Among the specific inquiry skills students will achieve are the following: (1) a capacity for asking the kinds of questions most likely to yield pertinent data;
b. To develop problem solving ability.	
c. To develop skills in thinking, studying, and learning.	
d. To make each student an independent learner.	

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
	(2) a capacity to make inductive inferences from data; (3) a capacity to combine generalizations in order to produce plausible explanations; (4) a capacity to hypothesize and plot investigations to test hypotheses; (5) a capacity to exploit conceptual models for inquiry; (6) a capacity to discriminate among and to make judgments about descriptive, explanatory, value, and prescriptive assertions.
e. An ability to use a wide variety of sources, including books, charts, graphs, maps, documents, visuals, etc.	e. We shall encourage the use of resources already familiar to most social studies teachers, e.g. books, pamphlets, maps, charts, graphs. In addition, we shall introduce certain kinds of data (e.g. demographic data), procedures for securing data (e.g. attitude scales), and procedures for handling data (e.g. frequency distribution tables) that are rarely used in existing courses.
f. Facility in both written and oral communication, including the acquisition and use of the specialized vocabulary of civics and government.	f. We share with other courses in the curriculum this general goal of advancing students' facility in written and oral communication. By imposing concepts from political science upon students, they will not simply acquire new words; these concepts will enable them to derive enriched meaning from their political environment.

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
g. Ability to recognize propaganda techniques.	g. This course has no provision for the study of propaganda as a separate act. However, the entire thrust of the course is directed toward helping students to acquire a capacity to make sophisticated judgments about claims and assertions. In this way, we will meet the goals implied in teaching about propaganda without setting it aside for special treatment.
3. Affective Goals:	3. Affective Goals:
a. To develop an appreciation for our heritage of free and democratic government.	a-g. All of these objectives are related to affecting students' attitudes toward democracy. We agree with the proponents of civic education that the over-riding objective of instruction in political education in the affective realm is to increase student acceptance of democracy. In our view democracy consists of two essential elements: majority rule and minority rights. Therefore, our courses should contribute to students' acceptance of practices of majority rule and protection of minority rights. Certain attitudes seem to be necessary for majority rule to function properly. Citizens must believe that they can influence decisions by government; citizens must be interested in politics; and citizens must agree to accept the decisions made by the majority as legitimate and binding. Protection of minority rights requires that citizens strive
b. To develop a feeling of responsibility for active and intelligent participation in civic affairs.	
c. To develop a desire to become better acquainted with the problems of our democracy.	
d. To develop faith in our ability to solve our problems within the framework of our form of government.	
e. To develop civic pride and responsibility.	
f. To create interest in civics and civic affairs.	
g. To develop better human relations.	

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
	to overcome ethnocentrism and to practice political tolerance. Citizens must also be willing to accept political pluralism. As political cynicism seems to inhibit one's ability to accept majority rule and protect minority rights, schools should seek to reduce political cynicism by students. Finally, citizens should desire to have evidence before making decisions. They should be unwilling to form judgments on the basis of prejudice, faith, or authority. Therefore, an appropriate attitudinal objective for courses in civics education is to foster decision processes based upon empirical evidence. In summary, the following statements comprise the specific attitudinal objectives of our ninth-grade course: (1) To increase a sense of political efficacy. (2) To increase political interest. (3) To increase the acceptance of the legitimacy of specific majority decision-making rights. (4) To increase political toleration. (5) To decrease ethnocentrism. (6) To increase acceptance of political pluralism. (7) To decrease political cynicism.

Typical Goals for Existing Courses in Ninth-grade Civics	Specific Goals for an Experimental Course in American Political Behavior
	(8) To increase acceptance of a scientific disposition toward the validation of explanations about political phenomena.

General Description of the Course:

The two-semester course in American Political Behavior intended for ninth-grade students focuses on the political behavior of individual American citizens. Following a one-week introduction to the course in which the concept of political behavior is made clear, students will study four major units of work, each averaging eight to nine weeks in length.

Unit I is entitled "The Context of American Political Behavior." The overarching purposes of this unit are to inform students of the social and physical context in which political behavior occurs, to make them familiar with the values and beliefs that constitute American political culture and the consequences such values and beliefs have for behavior, and to inform students about the process through which the political culture is learned and passed on.

Students are introduced to a number of concepts, including, political culture, society, physical environment, social environment, status, role, symbol. Moreover, students are taught to use a number of social science techniques to promote inquiry. Attitude scales and frequency distribution tables are merely two of the devices introduced in this unit. The way these are to be used are carefully taught in order that students will be able to use them with more confidence later in the course.

Investigation into values is picked up from the end of the first week and continued throughout this unit. Students are taught to discriminate between normative and empirical statements and are taught to be explicit about the criteria they are using to make judgments about value claims. Case studies that require both empirical and normative analysis are the principal resource for instruction in how to inquire into values.

Much of the data from which students will make inferences and hypothesize about American political attitudes and beliefs will be drawn from the values, attitudes, and beliefs of high school students. Various kinds of "confrontation lessons," including brief anecdotes, slide presentations, and role-playing episodes will be used to surface the attitudes and values of students.

Unit II provides the opportunity for students to learn how Americans act in their role as citizens, to study why they act as they do, and to consider whether they act in ways consistent with American ideals of citizen participation. Students will look into the psychological, social, and situational factors that influence citizen behavior. The relative influence on citizens played by such agencies as the mass media, political parties, and interest groups will be studied. A significant part of the unit will focus upon one kind of political behavior, voting behavior.

Students will explore the various ways citizens can bring pressure to bear on the system to gain favorable decisions. Students will read case studies illustrating successful tactics; near the close of the unit, they will play a simulation-game called "Influence" through which they can simulate what they have learned about the ways citizens can influence the political system.

Existing courses in civics and government attempt to "sell" students on the importance of becoming active participants in the political process. This unit is not a "hard sell" for active participation. Students will learn how Americans participate, why they are or are not active, how one could become active and make his influence felt if he wanted to do so, and what the costs and rewards of political activity are. Obviously, we hope that through our approach students will become more interested in politics and will have a greater sense of political efficacy. We do not disagree with the objectives of existing civics courses, but we believe that the "preachment approach" is ineffective with adolescents.

Unit III focuses upon individual citizens occupying "unofficial" political leadership roles. "Unofficial" political leaders are defined as citizens who exert political influence beyond that of typical American citizens but who do not hold positions in government. This is one of the topics in political education most neglected by existing high school civics and government courses. Present courses focus upon citizens and occupants of government positions. This ignores many people who are not often recognized as holding political positions but who are, nonetheless, immensely important in determining political decisions. Therefore, students will study community elites, political parties, interest groups, etc. They will investigate how people are recruited and trained for these "unofficial" leadership roles, how they exert influence, how they maintain their support and so on. Moreover, students will examine the costs and rewards for people who occupy such roles.

Unit IV is about citizens who are "official" political leaders, those who are employed by government. Four types of official leaders are studied: bureaucrats, legislators, judges, and heads of executive branches of government. By organizing the study of leaders in this way, students will become more conscious of the functional relationship that exists among mayors, governors, and the President, for example. Bureaucrats are ignored in most existing courses, despite the fact that there are more of them than there are other types of government personnel and despite the fact that citizens normally have more contact with bureaucrats than with other government officials. While much is known about bureaucrats and their role behavior, little of this knowledge is available to students through existing courses.

Throughout their study of the four types of official political leaders, bureaucrat, legislator, judge, and executive, students are expected to seek answers to questions like the following:

1. Who are official political leaders, and how are they recruited?
2. What is their socio-economic background?
3. How are they distinguished from the rest of the population by education, class, race, ethnic group, religious affiliation, etc.?
4. How were they trained for their roles? What special training or skill is required? Are these skills widely shared by the populace as a whole? Are these skills natural or rare? Can they be cultivated?
5. What expectations does the polity make of them?
6. How do they perceive their roles?
7. What norms or rules guide or constrain their conduct?
8. What do Americans demand in customs, habits, morality, etc. of their leaders?
9. What are the costs and rewards of leadership?
10. To what extent are leaders conditioned by their offices and to what extent is personality an important factor?
11. What personality characteristics seem to accompany various leadership roles? Do people seek these roles because of their natural personality or does the role determine their personality?
12. Do national leaders differ as a group from state and local leaders? Do leaders tend to be different according to function -- e.g. are governors different from legislators, from judges, etc.?
13. To what extent do men occupy various leadership roles during a lifetime?
14. What happens to "retired" leaders?

The goals we hope to accomplish are similar to those of existing civics courses, although we have included some topics that many civics courses ignore and ignored others that civics courses presently teach. The principal difference between our course and the typical civics course lies in our perspective and the strategies we use to teach students. Some of the pedagogical implications of our course are discussed in the following section.

Some Essential Characteristics of the Course in American Political Behavior:

There are a number of topics that dominate current writing and discussion on teaching the social studies. Among the most important of these topics are the following: the structure of the discipline; the use of concepts in designing curriculum; teaching the processes or modes of inquiry in social studies; and the role of values in social studies instruction. In one way or another, each social studies curriculum designer must come to terms with these issues before proceeding with his own work. Some have turned their backs to one or more of them; others have tried to ascribe meaning to them that relates to their own curricular design. I have chosen to describe our approach to these issues at some length in this paper, not only because the reader has a right to know what we mean when we use these terms in curriculum design, but also because some discussion about these issues also clarifies aspects of our course in American Political Behavior. For the most part, this essay is based upon the assumption that the reader is more-or-less familiar with the debates that surround these issues. I have chosen to identify only our stance.

Structure of a discipline. Jerome Bruner's book, The Process of Education, has had an enormous influence upon curriculum development efforts in the social studies. Bruner's notions about "structure" was one of the powerful ideas contained in this book. Bruner argued that every discipline has a way of approaching its subject matter, that the way a scholar studies the subject matter of his discipline constitutes a kind of "structure of the discipline," and that the best way to teach children about a given discipline is to teach them the structure of the discipline. By grasping the structure of a discipline, students have a handle for organizing data and making sense of the discipline.

Bruner's views on "structure" have had both positive and negative effects. Positively, his ideas have encouraged developers to search for new ways to organize or to structure subject matter. The negative contribution is not so much the fault of Bruner as it is the simplistic way in which his notion has been interpreted. It has led some to search for "the structure" of each discipline, as if structure were something almost metaphysical -- a kind of natural law -- that once discovered would resolve all problems relating to selection of content. Certainly, Bruner never intended this. Others understood that Bruner meant intellectual structures, patterns of organization that scholars have constructed in their own minds through their experience that enable them to order the data in their own fields. This understanding led some curriculum developers to ask scholars in each of the social science disciplines to identify the structure that characterized each discipline in order that the curriculum designer might begin his work with greater confidence. While this undoubtedly brings the curriculum designer more closely in step with Bruner, it too represents a naive view of intellectual activity in each of the social science disciplines. The problem stems from a misreading of what a "structure" is.

To the extent that a structure can be identified in a discipline, it simply represents the current theory that some scholars use to order what is currently known about their field. In social science, there is no widespread agreement on such theories nor do scholars normally try to force such agreement. They know that theories or structures serve the purpose of enabling a scholar to keep in mind a great mass of data while thinking about very little at a time. A scholar uses theory to help him learn more; as he learns, he will constantly need to revise his theory. In short, structure is not a "thing" waiting to be discovered; it is a way to organize existing knowledge in a field to advance knowledge. A given structure is to be judged as good or bad according to its utility in achieving its purpose.

Anyone who has paid any attention to developments in political science knows that it is impossible to identify "the structure of political science." The number of "structures" is at least as large as the variety of scholars who call themselves political scientists. Under the umbrella of the American Political Science Association are found political philosophers, historians, sociologists, psychologists, politicians, and many more. Their views on what political science is vary enormously. Therefore, one searching for the structure of political science is doomed for disappointment.

Nevertheless, it is possible "to structure" political science. One can identify an aspect of political science that is deemed worthy to teach, and it is possible to bring data relating to this aspect of political science into some sort of order. While there are no overarching theories or structures of political science to which all scholars agree, there are a number of middle-range theories that some scholars have found to provide utility in advancing knowledge about politics. Such middle-range theories "structure" or organize concepts that political scientists have found useful for acquiring greater meaning from political phenomena. These concepts contribute to low-level theories and are generated by theory. Therefore, while there is no one "structure" in political science waiting in the wings until the curriculum designer calls it to front stage to be taught to all children, there are a number of concepts that political scientists have invented or borrowed that aid them in their work. These concepts are worth knowing; they can be related to each other; and they can form the basis of an organized study of civics and government in the schools.

Concepts. It is important to be clear what a concept is. It is a name for a class of things or events. It is a category. Revolution is a concept; the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution are events, not concepts. The concept of revolution has been invented to classify particular events or things such as the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution. Without concepts there would be no way to process, store, and retrieve data; and we would be overwhelmed by the data pressing in on us.

A simple concept such as mother, for example, permits us to make a number of assumptions about a particular woman, once we have learned she is a mother. We know that she has children, probably is married, is beyond puberty, and likely receives gifts on Mother's Day.

Concepts may be held at varying levels of sophistication. At the simplest level they enable us to make gross judgments and comparisons. As our ability to use the concept grows, so also do the levels of meaning. The concepts "house" and "home" may at one level refer to the same object. However, a woman might refuse to sell her home but be eager to sell her house. The title of the well-known book A House is Not a Home seems strange to some but conveys meaning to others who know what is implied by the concepts.

An anecdote may further illustrate the point. According to this account, a woman was walking down the sidewalk in an eastern city. Glancing across the street, she saw her friend rushing down the opposite sidewalk. Cutting across the street, the first woman stopped her friend and asked:

> "What is the matter? You appear as if you have just received tragic news."
>
> "I've just left my son's psychiatrist. He told me that Johnny has an Oedipus complex."
>
> "Oedipus, Schmoedipus! What is important is that Johnny is a good boy, and he loves his mother!"

This joke is humorous only to one who knows what an Oedipus complex is. It is not humorous to a child or to an adult who knows nothing about psychology or "Oedipus Rex." Knowing the concept Oedipus complex enables one to ascribe meaning to the anecdote. It may also be true that a psychiatrist would see more meaning in the anecdote than a layman who has only a vague notion concerning what the term means.

It is important to note that the term Oedipus complex is an intellectual invention used to describe a particular form of psychological behavior. As a scientific concept, it has meaning only because scientists mean something when they use it. If scientists learn that the concept no longer is useful, i.e. new information indicates the term is not so valid as previously believed, scientists will either replace it with a more useful concept or change what they mean when they use it. Of course, laymen will likely continue to use it long after it has been declared useless by science.

The concept totalitarianism illustrates this point in political science. Totalitarianism was invented by political scientists in the 1950's to enable scholars to classify data that was known about real political systems. The concept followed the real conditions and was invented as a way of thinking about these systems. In the last few years, as additional information about these real systems has become available, the concept of totalitarianism has been under attack by scholars. This has led some political scientists to discontinue using the term, while others have sought to bring the concept into line with new knowledge. It is important to note that it was in part the invention of the concept of totalitarianism that led to investigations that produced data leading to an attack on the concept, thereby requiring a new meaning for the term.

Some concepts that we use regularly are so vague that they either have to be qualified or we have to make assumptions about the knowledge and attitudes of the listener in order for them to have any real meaning. For example, all that is known for certain about someone who is described as a "loyal American" is that he is a citizen of the United States. We know nothing about his values, attitudes, beliefs, and political behavior unless we know a great deal about the person who is describing him. Such terms as "liberal" and "conservative" are often used to classify people, ideas, and programs. These terms are so slippery, so open to multiple meanings, that they are practically useless to political scientists seeking to explain political phenomena, unless each time they are used they are given specific, contextual definitions. One of the reasons terms such as "liberal" and "conservative" are so slippery is that they represent a tangle of both normative and empirical assertions. One of the tasks of political scientists is to invent concepts that enable them to classify and organize data more precisely and thereby enable them to derive more meaning from political behavior.

The fundamental purpose of formal education is to enable students to acquire batteries of concepts that enable them to derive more meaning from their experience and the experience of others. Robert Hanvey argues that the essential difference between the "educated" and the "uneducated" man is that the former sees more meanings. The difference between a specialist and a layman in any field is that the specialist sees more meaning, because he has access to concepts that are denied the layman. When I complain to my doctor that I seem to "have caught a bug," he recognizes this as a "folk description" of my malady. Through his own analysis, he will acquire a far more sophisticated description of my illness that he can subsequently communicate with rich meaning to other doctors. He may tell me that, indeed, I do have a "bug," merely because he assumes that I am unable to cope with a higher level of abstraction. However, suppose the same doctor wishes to describe the performance of his "sick" television set to a repairman trained in electronics. The doctor will probably be reduced to a "folk description," indicating perhaps that his T.V. has a "bug" in the wiring.

Political scientists and other social scientists have invented and borrowed concepts that are often unfamiliar to laymen and that enable scholars to see more meaning in political phenomena than do laymen. The principal task of teachers in courses in civics and government is to transmit as many of these concepts as possible to children in order that they may begin to derive greater meaning from political society.

Unfortunately, the growing interest in teaching concepts has led some teachers to claim that they no longer teach facts; they teach concepts, without knowing the difference between the two. They must learn that concepts are simply intellectual inventions that are useful and valid only so long as they can be used successfully. Concepts found useful today may be deemed useless tomorrow. Concepts should be learned for what they are -- intellectual tools that enable us to classify and organize data and to direct our investigation. Many of the concepts that political scientists use today were not used ten years ago. Doubtless many in use today will not be retained into the next decade.

The foregoing discussion is not meant to imply that teachers do not use concepts each day in their instruction on civics and government. The essential problem is that many teachers are unaware that they are teaching concepts and therefore do the task poorly; moreover, many of the concepts they teach are of relatively low order, are relatively useless when compared to others, and often are already possessed by students prior to enrolling in the course, thereby making such instruction redundant.

An illustration may clarify this matter. In talks to high school teachers during the past months I have used the following chart:

DOCTOR SHERIFF
CONGRESSMAN
GOVERNOR MINISTER
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
NEWSPAPER EDITOR
TOWN BANKER PRESIDENT
NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION
ARMY GENERAL MAYOR
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER
COUNTY JUDGE

I inform teachers that these various occupational and avocational roles may be classified according to a political point of view, and I ask teachers to classify the various terms into categories (concepts) that have political connotations.

First of all, many teachers decide that doctor, minister, town banker, and newspaper editor are not political roles. Therefore, a common kind of categorization frequently suggested is "political and non-political." Some teachers will take the "political" roles, i.e. excluding the four occupations noted above, and categorize them according to "levels" of government, i.e. local, state, and national. Others will categorize them according to "branches" of government, i.e. executive, legislative, and judicial. Some will classify them according to how they gain political positions, i.e. elected and appointed leaders. A few will use the term "interest group" and place the National Commander of the American Legion in that category.

With a few exceptions, the categories noted above exhaust the ones offered by high school teachers of civics and government. This is not surprising. These are the categories contained in their civics and government books. These are the categories they learned in school and are the ones they teach their students.

I recently used this same chart with a social studies education class at Indiana University. For the most part, the pattern of response was identical to that of high school teachers. There was one exception. One young man offered entirely different categories. Among his categories were the following:

1. political socializers: newspaper editor, minister, school board member
2. community elites: doctor, banker, minister, editor
3. pattern maintenance: sheriff, army general

Upon investigation I learned that he had earned approximately 20 hours of college credit in political science. He saw meaning in these terms that escaped his classmates. For example, he saw the banker, doctor, and minister as playing potential political roles while others had ruled them out. Having more political concepts enabled him to derive greater meaning from the data revealed in the chart.

The course in American Political Behavior seeks to translate concepts used by political scientists in their study of political behavior into terms ninth-graders can understand, to structure these concepts into a course of study -- i.e. to bring concepts into some logical and scientific relationship to each other -- to impose these concepts on students, and to provide practice in their proper use by planning investigations through which the concepts are made operational. Once students gain control of these concepts, they will have increased sensitivity toward what is political in their social environment. The pedagogical strategy that will be adopted in each case will be the one that classroom trials of the materials indicates is the one most likely to fix the concept for students successfully. All the concepts will not be imposed in the same way. Two illustrations may reveal some of the variety of strategies that are utilized.

During the first week of the course, teachers will impose the concept of "political behavior." Since the course is about American political behavior, it seems only fair to let the students in on what they will be studying for the following 36 weeks. More importantly, once students grasp this concept, subsequent materials will be easier for them to understand.

The term "political behavior" is defined on the first day. There is some danger in this, because while it is possible to define concepts, it is not really possible to specify meaning. What political behavior means to a student will develop as he acquires experience in using the concept. However, students cannot begin to work with the term until an operational definition is provided. In addition, we indicate definitions for "private" political behavior and "public" political behavior.

On the second day, students are confronted with five, brief anecdotes that they are to analyze according to certain criteria given to them. This includes categorizing the political acts according to whether they are essentially "private" or "public" political acts. On the third day, following a brief description of how one might classify political acts into rough stages leading to decision-making and following upon a description of the way in which political scientists conduct "observations" of political behavior, students are asked to "observe" a political act and report their observations according to the criteria previously established.

On the fourth day, students are asked to read a case study involving a series of political acts spanning one week in an Indiana community that resulted in the decision by the school board to fire a high school English teacher, a decision prompted in part by political statements of the English teacher that were unacceptable to the community. Students analyze this case study according to criteria regarding political behavior that they have used on the three previous days. The case study affords the opportunity for them to apply the criteria learned earlier to a more complex situation. While there are other objectives in mind during this first week, a primary objective is to impose the concept political behavior in such a way that the student can use it confidently and build upon it throughout the course.

Not all concepts are introduced and taught in the same way. For example, before students are introduced to the concept "political culture," they read three open-ended anecdotes relating to three types of political situations that are found in all societies. The students are asked to conclude the open-ended anecdotes by answering the question "What will happen next?" The expectation is that they will respond to the anecdotes in terms of their own political culture. After completing each of the anecdotes, students are presented with two brief ethnographic descriptions that show how individuals from two different societies typically cope with the political situations that were described in the open-ended episodes. Students are asked to compare and contrast these ethnographic descriptions with their responses to the open-ended anecdotes. Next, they are asked to speculate about why different groups of people may typically respond in very different ways to a common political problem. We expect that these speculations could become "intuitive leaps" whereby students will begin to think in terms of cultural influences upon behavior prior to undergoing a systematic study of political culture. Thus, the open-ended anecdotes and the following ethnographic descriptions are made to serve a heuristic function for the students. They trigger insight into the interrelationship between political culture and political behavior. This confrontation episode is followed by a careful study of the interrelationship of political culture and political behavior.

We do not feel bound by an ideology regarding what pedagogical strategy to use each day. We intend to be eclectic, adopting whatever strategy seems most likely to achieve our objective. For example, "discovery exercises" will be used when it suits our purpose; but it is pointless and inefficient to use discovery strategies to get at definitions, for example. If a student requires certain information before he can engage in a successful investigation, we will provide whatever is necessary for him to know.

Inquiry. Social studies teachers and curriculum directors know there is more to teaching social studies than teaching "content." Teaching students how to solve "problems" and developing skills of "critical thinking" are often viewed as important for students' development in social studies as teaching "facts" from history and social science. Beginning around 1963 more was heard about teaching the "modes of inquiry" of historians and social scientists. This notion, associated with many of the new social studies curriculum development projects, probably was borrowed from the various science curriculum development projects that preceded Project Social Studies. The science projects provided unusual opportunities for students to conduct scientific investigations. A desire to emulate the science projects has contributed some new approaches to teaching social studies that clearly distinguishes the "new social studies" from the old. It also gave rise to terms that have become associated with this general mood or approach, terms such as "the inductive approach," "discovery approach," and "inquiry approach."

As a device for attacking the social studies curriculum development projects, some critics have charged that the projects seem intent on training all students to be historians or social scientists. In fact, the intent of the projects seems to be that of operationalizing in very specific ways the more general citizenship skills others have sought to develop through "problem-solving" and "critical-thinking" approaches. The interest in inquiry is, in effect, a recognition that all students should learn how to process social science data, should learn the basic rules entailed by logic and empirical investigation, should know something about how assertions and claims can be substantiated. What is strikingly different about the projects is that rather than have students memorize "six-steps" defined as the "scientific method," the projects systematically construct classroom exercises that enable students to acquire the rudimentary skills of logical thinking and empirical investigation.

It is important to note that for inquiry to occur, one must inquire into something. To make inquiry simply a skill one learns, separating it from substantive knowledge, is as foolish as another idea contained in the once-popular cliche: "We teach students not subjects." Of course, we teach students; but we must teach them something. Of course, it is important to engage in inquiry, but there must be an object for the inquiry. The object of our inquiry is American political behavior. We intend to teach students some of the specific techniques that are used by political scientists when they engage in political inquiry, as well as the logic of explanation and the basic approaches to the validation of propositions that are the same for every discipline that purports to be scientific. [A detailed discussion regarding the rules and procedures for scientific investigation are beyond the scope of this paper. A few useful references for the reader who might wish to explore this matter further are noted below.[8]]

Throughout this course, students will learn how information relating to American political behavior is acquired, how it is organized, how generalizations are validated, and so on. As the content of the course is structured, so too is the inquiry process. Students must be trained in the techniques of social science inquiry in a careful and systematic way. For example, ninth-grade students must learn how to organize and categorize data before they can be asked to make inferences from the data. We shall teach students step-by-step how to conduct social science inquiry. By the end of the course, students should be able to conduct small, simple investigations largely on their own.

One of the distinctive characteristics of the course in American Political Behavior is the use of laboratory exercises. These exercises are the social science equivalent of the types of laboratory experiments that regularly occur in chemistry, physics, or biology classrooms. Each week the teacher is provided with controlled social science experiments to conduct, generally in class but on occasion in the field. Students will record their observations and interpretations in laboratory manuals.

---

[8] Frohock, Fred M. The Nature of Political Inquiry. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967; Hullfish, H. Gordon, and Smith, Philip G. Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1965, Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1964; Meehan, Eugene J. The Theory and Method of Political Analysis. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1965.

It is important to discriminate this use of the term "laboratory" in civic education from another kind of civic education laboratory made popular in the 1950's. The Citizenship Education Project located at Teachers College, Columbia University contributed significantly to the notion that students should learn about citizenship by taking a more active part in school and community affairs. To further this goal, the community was conceived of as a "laboratory." A laboratory practice contained four essential characteristics: 1) Students were to deal with real situations. Rather than participate in mock elections in the school, for example, they were to participate actively in actual election campaigns. 2) Students were to secure information first hand. Rather than rely entirely upon books for information, they were to ask public officials directly for information they desired. 3) The task to be accomplished was less important than what was learned by doing the task. It was argued that the best way for students to learn about democracy was by taking part in it. 4) Related to the above, students were to take action. They were to make up their minds about an issue and then try to push it through to a successful conclusion.[9]

Our notion of a "laboratory" is quite different. Without deciding on the merits of the idea that students learn best by taking an active part in community affairs, we know from experience that it is practically impossible to have students released from school on a regular basis to accomplish what the Citizenship Education Project would have students do. If such activities are reserved for after school time, the problem of what to do in class remains. Moreover, parents as well as public officials quickly complain if students seem to be demanding constantly the attention of government employees. Another kind of laboratory experience can be created within the classroom.

---

[9] Three sources are especially useful for a description of the work of the Citizenship Education Project. They are: Resources for Citizenship. New York Columbia University, 1955; Laboratory Practices in Citizenship. New York: Columbia University, 1958; and Vincent, William S. and others. Building Better Programs in Citizenship. New York: Columbia University, 1958.

It might be useful to describe one laboratory exercise in order to make more clear what we are about. The reader is asked to understand that this classroom exercise is taken out of context; much will have preceded and set the stage for this lesson; much more follows to complete operations only initiated in this lesson. This exercise occurs during the fifth week of the course and is a part of a section on political culture that is a major division of Unit I entitled the "Context of American Political Behavior." This lesson has three major goals: to impose the concept of political symbols, to further students' skill at making inferences from data; and to enable students to offer hypotheses relating to the sources of political socialization that will provide the impetus for future investigation.

The class begins by the teacher distributing to each student a typical Likert-type scale that is reproduced in part below:

Directions: You will be shown ten pictures of objects that may or may not have something to do with the way you think about politics and your political behavior. On this page are ten reaction scales which can help you to measure your political feeling about the objects in each of these ten pictures. Place a check mark in one of the five spaces in each of the scales below in order to show how you feel about the objects in each of the ten pictures.

1.	Very Bad Feeling	Bad Feeling	Little Or No Feeling	Good Feeling	Very Good Feeling
2.	Very Bad Feeling	Bad Feeling	Little Or No Feeling	Good Feeling	Very Good Feeling

. . . . and so on through number ten.

Students are shown ten, 35mm. color slides that are pictures of political symbols. The pictures are as follows: 1) American Flag; 2) Communist Chinese Flag; 3) Statue of Liberty; 4) Presidential Seal; 5) Lenin Medal; 6) Nazi Poster; 7) U.S. Marine Monument; 8) Soviet Political Rally; 9) President Johnson; 10) St. Basil's Cathedral. As each slide is shown, each student marks his reaction to the slide by checking one of the blanks on the reaction scale.

After all the slides have been shown, the teacher distributes the students' reaction scales among the class members so that no student knows whose scale he has. Together with the class the teacher builds a frequency distribution table of class responses to each picture, recording the data on a transparency projected on a screen behind the teacher. The data from a typical class of 25 students is as follows:

TABULATIONS OF REACTIONS TO POLITICAL SYMBOLS

Symbol	Reaction Scale				
	VBF	BF	LNF	GF	VGF
1. American Flag				10	15
2. Communist Chinese Flag	10	12	3		
3. Statue of Liberty				18	7
4. Presidential Seal			5	15	5
5. Lenin Medal	4	15	6		
6. Nazi Poster	2	8	15		
7. U.S. Marine Monument			4	18	3
8. Soviet Political Rally		10	15		
9. President Johnson	1	2	2	15	5
10. St. Basil's Cathedral		2	22	1	

After the data has been assembled in a manner similar to that shown above, the teacher asks students, "What do you conclude from this data?" For most ninth-grade students this represents a leap they are unable to take. Therefore, rather than simply encourage guessing, the teacher helps students build the little bridges that make such a long leap unnecessary.

The teacher may run the slides through the projector again, asking students to note the characteristics of the slide that prompted their reactions. The American flag, the Statue of Liberty, and some others are obvious and require little reflection. The slide of President Johnson always triggers diffuse reactions. A minority react to him as a person, and their marks are therefore based upon whether they like him as a man. A few students see him as a partisan leader; therefore, Democrats tend to rate him high while Republicans rank him low. The majority of students, however, see him as the President, the chief representative of the United States. They assign feelings to him that they hold for their country.

Some slides rarely trigger a strong response. For example, most ninth-graders do not recognize St. Basil's cathedral. One girl who noted the crosses on the tower, thereby recognizing it as a church, marked it "good." When she was told that St. Basil's is on Red Square in Moscow, she asked that her mark on that slide be changed from "good" to "bad." Nevertheless, most students mark pictures that they fail to recognize as "little or no feeling."

After showing the slides a second time, providing an opportunity for students to explain why they reacted as they did, it is but a short step for them to conclude that the pictures represent feelings they have about their country and its opponents. They recognize that they have assigned meaning to the pictures. The slides symbolize social institutions and processes that they either respect or despise. The students are able to reach this idea essentially on their own, although the teacher may have to help construct a definition for the term symbol that can be made operational throughout the rest of the course.

Although the students now understand that the symbols represent feelings they have, they have not explained why they hold such feelings. We have found it useful to draw three boxes, one each around the "good" and "very good," the "bad" and "very bad," and the "little or no feeling" categories. The teacher asks his students to study the symbols represented by each of these gross categories and to explain what they have in common. Students quickly see that the slides marked "good" and "very good" have something to do with the United States; the slides marked "bad" and "very bad" -- represented primarily by Communist and Nazi symbols -- all stand for perceived current or post enemies of the United States; and the "little or no feeling" slides were those that students did not recognize. Many ninth-grade students attach little meaning to the Nazi symbol. For them, it is only an historic symbol, when they recognize it at all.

When I have used this lesson with youngsters, I have asked them whether they think other American students would respond much as they did? American adults? They conclude that their responses are probably in line with other Americans. Thereafter, the dialogue often has assumed the following form:

Teacher: How do you think Soviet students would react to these same slides, if I were to show them to the students at Moscow High School?

Student: Well, they would react quite differently -- just the opposite from us. They would mark the American symbols "bad" or "very bad" and the Communist symbols "good" or "very good."

Teacher: Why? You thought all American students would react in much the same way. Why do you think Soviet students would react so differently from you?

Student: Because from the moment they are born they are taught to hate the United States and love Communism and the Soviet Union. They learn this at home from their parents, from their teachers at school---.

Teacher: How did you learn to respect the American symbols and dislike the Communist ones?

Student: Well---, I guess we were taught to believe this way.

Teacher: How?

Student: By our parents, teachers, at church, and in Boy Scouts, and---

Teacher: Let's write each of these on the board and try to think of other people or institutions that influence how we think politically.

The first part of this lesson is primarily an inductive exercise. The slides provoke the students into surfacing their own political attitudes; the teacher records them on a frequency distribution table; and students are led to make inferences on the basis of the data.

The dialogue described above represents another type of thinking. Students are engaged in retroductive thinking, hypothesizing, or what some have referred to as "intuitive leaping." The data does not suggest the sources of political socialization; but the data, together with the children's experience, and the right questions by a teacher creates the conditions that lead to profitable hypothesizing. By the close of this lesson students are ready to pose hypotheses regarding the agents of political socialization and to map strategies leading to the testing of these hypotheses.

It is important to note that the teacher is largely in control of the operation. For the most part, the responses of students -- at least the direction of response -- are predictable. This means that we can design a laboratory exercise and provide instructions for teachers with considerable confidence that the lesson will proceed in a predictable course. The chemistry teacher and the biology teacher demand even more predictability or they would often lack the security necessary to conduct laboratory investigations with students. Inquiry is often a problem to social studies teachers because they lack the knowledge enabling them to predict where the investigation might lead. Controlled laboratory exercises of the kind described above provide a needed training and experience for students while avoiding unreasonable demands on teachers.

Values. Value claims permeate political discourse. The American system of government was established to secure "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; each of these concepts entail value judgments. Regime policies are defended and attacked according to whether they appear to support or undermine basic American values.

In the American Political Behavior course values are treated as one of the elements of the American political culture. Students will study those political values that seem more or less universals in American culture as well as many of the values held by sub-groups. Students will learn the degree to which values influence behavior. Moreover, they will learn how values are transmitted in a society. The early part of the course affords opportunities for students to surface their own political values, enabling them to compare their values with those held by other groups in America and abroad and to use their values as data from which generalizations about American political culture can be made.

In keeping with the behavioral approach, students will learn to discriminate between statements of fact and statements of value and to recognize the difference between empirical explanation and ethical evaluation. While making observations or stating inferences from data, students will learn to separate what is from how they would like it to be.

The typical civics course preaches American values and provides little opportunity for students to inquire into political values. As most students have acquired fundamental American political values by the ninth grade, preaching these values merely contributes to the redundancy of existing courses. Conducting inquiries into political values need not result in iconoclasm. Although preaching values at the ninth grade might be useless because it is redundant, a conscious attempt by a teacher to overturn children's political values is totally indefensible. Nevertheless, teachers can provide opportunities for students to acquire greater understanding of the values they hold by enabling them to consider acting according to their values.

An illustration may clarify this issue. Americans value the right to vote for candidates of their choice. This value may be viewed as a subvalue of a set of values relating to the majority rule principle entailed by the democratic process. Civics teachers are rarely content with having students value the right to vote; in addition, they attempt to sell students on their obligation or duty to vote. Despite generations of civics and government teachers preaching the citizen's responsibility to vote, many Americans -- frequently more than one-half of the eligible voters -- fail to vote in elections.

We shall approach this issue a bit different from that approach taken by the typical civics course. In Unit I students will explore American political values, including the right to vote. The second unit focuses on the ways in which Americans participate in politics, including as voters. Students will quickly learn that the fact of voter participation in this country is not the same as the ideal. Why reality is less than that professed by American ideals will be the subject of student investigation.

Suppose that students learn that lack of incentive and lack of information are two important explanations for low citizen participation as voters.

Students might wish to consider policies that might add incentive to the voting act and policies that ensure more political information for potential voters.

In a recent election in a large midwestern city approximately 80 per cent of the eligible voters cast their ballots. This is an unusually high percentage for an American election. As each voter left the polls, he was given a dozen eggs. No one asked the voter how he voted, but few doubted which political organization provided the eggs. The leader of the political organization was re-elected mayor by a large margin. In an earlier election in the same city, voters were given chances on color television sets. It is likely that these rewards added to the voter's incentive to cast his ballot. If lack of incentive is one cause for a poor voter turnout, should voters be paid for voting or non-voters be fined for staying away?

In certain communist countries it is a common practice to have regular meetings of citizens in the neighborhood, on the farm, in the factory, at school, and so on. These weekly meetings provide an opportunity to further the political education of the masses. If American citizens fail to vote because they lack information, a law requiring that every American adult attend a political discussion group once a week in order that he might become better acquainted with political issues might contribute to greater citizen participation as voters.

Of course, we are not advocating either of the above policies or any other policy that might increase voter turnout. The illustration was offered merely to reveal one way that students can move from a description of what _is_ to a discussion of what _should be_. Policy issues rise naturally from an examination of American political behavior. For example, Unit I makes clear that both loyalty to the political system and the right to dissent to regime policies are cherished American political values. The contemporary period is one in which these two values not only create conflict within the body politic, but also conflict within the hearts of many thoughtful Americans. To avoid such issues would be unthinkable.

It is unlikely that our approach to the study of values will contribute to resolving questions regarding the optimum way to study values. Philosophers have been unable to agree on an answer to this problem. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to wait until this issue is resolved before students are encouraged to conduct inquiries into value questions.

If students can learn to avoid confusing normative statements with factual ones, to avoid making factual conclusions from normative premises and vice-versa, to examine the consequences of value choices, and to look for and to make judgments about the premises upon which value claims are made, considerable progress will have occurred. Making students alert to the role values play in political behavior and helping them to acquire some skill in making judgments about various value claims should be a significant contribution to a civic education that has heretofore largely turned its back on this matter.

Pilot Trials and Evaluation of Project Materials:

An experimental curriculum development center must treat its product as an experiment. Once objectives have been clarified and materials prepared to meet these objectives, the entire package must undergo rigorous trial and evaluation to learn if the program is effective. Because they are often reluctant to release their work until it has been proved, curriculum directors have gained some notoriety among teachers who clamor for the experimental materials at an early stage of their development. Unlike textbook publishers who generally make no claims about the effectiveness of their books --

except by occasional testimonials from satisfied customers -- curriculum project directors strive to prepare packages that are tested again and again under varying circumstances until finally they can say with confidence: "If our course is used in the way we prescribe with X kind of students, we predict that it will achieve Y results." It is then left to the customer to decide if he has X kind of students and whether he wants Y results.

The ideal setting for curriculum development is one in which the developer can try his course -- in segments and as a whole, revising and testing, over and over again -- until he is satisfied that it will perform successfully in the hands of others. In fact, such ideal settings rarely occur. Developers are faced by time and budgetary limitations. Therefore, compromises are made in order to abide by the provisions of contracts. While a developer *could* announce at the end of an extended contract that he has nothing to release to the public because he has not had sufficient success in proving his product, in fact there is subtle pressure to produce something at the end of the contract. Developers feel at least two tugs: one to continue writing, testing, and evaluating until they are completely satisfied with the result; and another tug to finish the job.

Curriculum development is a process that passes through five stages: 1) stating assumptions, defining objectives, designing and blueprinting the package; 2) writing materials aimed at achieving stated objectives; 3) pilot testing of the course followed by revisions and additional trials until the package is pronounced ready; 4) evaluating the package through use by teachers not involved in the earlier stages of development; 5) making final revisions and submitting final report. The ninth-grade course in American Political Behavior has passed through stage one. Our assumptions, objectives, and course design were described earlier in this paper. We are currently operating in stage two. Course materials are being prepared for pilot trials scheduled to begin in September, 1968. During the current year bits and pieces of the course are being tried with ninth-graders in order to gain early feedback regarding the difficulty of the materials.

The academic year 1968-1969 constitutes stage three in the development of the American Political Behavior course. The pilot trials will proceed on two fronts. Mr. Patrick and I will teach one class of Bloomington ninth-grade students using the experimental materials. This should afford us immediate, direct, and daily feedback on the course. It is quite possible to begin the revision of a segment of the course within minutes of the time it was taught. A trained classroom observer will attend each session of our class, maintaining a log on both teacher and students. Audio tapes and video tapes will also be used for analysis of the class. We hope through these techniques and others to devise a feedback design that will enable us to spot weaknesses in the program quickly and efficiently.

The assistance of regular classroom teachers becomes indispensable to curriculum development during stage three. During 1968-1969, the American Political Behavior course will be piloted in approximately 20 classrooms in other parts of the country. The pilot teachers who will teach these materials will have been trained in a seven-week institute at Indiana University during summer, 1968. Teachers attending the institute will earn four hours graduate credit in Government while receiving instruction on American Political Behavior from a political scientist, and they will earn four hours of graduate credit in Education while receiving instruction in the theory and pedagogy of the ninth-grade course in American Political Behavior. Members of the Center staff will teach the Education component of the institute. In addition, Mr. Patrick will teach a demonstration class of ninth-grade students using the new materials. In this way, institute participants will receive instruction on the content of political behavior, gain insight into how to teach the new course, and observe the course being taught. Moreover, they will receive special instruction in how to evaluate the course with their own students, enabling them to effectively assist in the revision process. Pilot teachers are almost useless at this stage of development unless they have a clear conception of what the course is intended to accomplish. The teachers who will be working with us should be enormously useful in helping the Center secure a satisfactory product.

The majority of the pilot teachers teach in Indiana, perhaps one or two in Bloomington. We can have regular, personal contact with these teachers. In addition, we have made arrangements with a few schools in other parts of the country. If there is a regional bias in the course, we wish to discover it early.

Hopefully, one year of intensive pilot testing will be sufficient for stage three. By utilizing the feedback gained from our pilot teachers, a revised version of the ninth-grade course will be readied for experimental trials beginning in September, 1969. The course is all but finished at this stage. Twenty to thirty teachers will teach the course experimentally for one year to learn if it produces the expected results.

The research design for evaluating the course is a simple one. While our funds are not adequate to conduct the type of field experiment many would deem desirable, they are sufficient to conduct limited experiments aimed at producing some interesting results. The sample of schools will not be drawn on a random basis. The difficulties in achieving such a sample and the costs entailed are tremendous. From among the many schools that have asked to collaborate with our project, certain representative types will be chosen. The materials will be tested in four kinds of school settings: rural, consolidated, or small town (schools that include a high proportion of rural youngsters); small city (50,000-200,000 population); large city (over 200,000 population); and affluent suburban community lying on the fringe of a large city. These schools should enable us to include in the total sample a variety of ethnic groups and a broad range of socio-economic backgrounds. "Average," "gifted," and "disadvantaged" students will study the experimental course. Moreover, the materials will be tested in four different regions of the nation: Far West, Middle West, South East, and North East.

Each school will be treated as an individual experiment. In order to partially account for the teacher-variable in the success or failure of the course, each school system will provide at least two experimental teachers. Schools will schedule a control class at the same time as an experimental class, enabling us to randomize the assignment of experimental and control students from a common pool of students.

The control class in each school will study the typical ninth-grade social studies course in that school, in most cases civics. The experimental teacher will teach the experimental course as prescribed in the package. He will not be permitted to alter, revise, or delete materials during the experiment. The control class should be kept free of contamination with the experimental course. A few of the pilot teachers who assisted in stage three and who received special training during summer, 1968, will be included in the experiment. At least one-half of the experimental teachers will be civics teachers who have not received special training. One of the factors to be determined is whether teachers can teach the course successfully without special training while relying solely upon the detailed instructions provided with the course.

At the end of the academic year, paper and pencil tests will be given to both control and experimental classes in each cooperating school. These tests will measure gains by students in knowledge about politics and government, in skills of inquiry, and in achieving objectives relating to political values and attitudes. The results of each experiment will be reported separately and will be linked to the carefully defined student population that comprised each sample. Whenever possible, the data from the individual experiments will be thrown together in an effort to produce generalizations that tie success or failure in the course to sex, I.Q., socio-economic background, school setting, ethnic group, etc.

In Conclusion:

Recently, a newspaper editor asked me what I thought would be the likely consequences to the American political system, if our course were to be used in high schools throughout the nation and were to be successful in achieving its objectives. Suppose Americans were to become aware of the factors that cause them to behave politically, might they not alter their political behavior on the basis of their new perceptions, he wondered. If people were to become aware of techniques used to influence public policy, would this lead to the necessity for new techniques? If people were to become trained observers of political behavior, would they become too self-conscious to participate?

Most project directors do not permit themselves the excitement of thinking about what the world would be like if they were really successful. They are too much aware of the obstacles that impede change in education. Moreover, they are usually distracted by more pedestrian targets, e.g. meeting deadlines during the preparation of course materials, designing evaluation instruments that might provide some valid, tangible evidence of what their courses have accomplished, etc. Nevertheless, the newspaper editor's questions were perceptive. Every project director should ask himself sometime: What if the schools take us seriously and the stuff works?

Kenneth Boulding recently asked the rhetorical question: "Dare we take the social sciences seriously?" He argued that social scientists not only observe and describe the social system, the ultimate effect of their study is to change it. According to Boulding,

> Science is corrosive of all values which are based exclusively on simpler epistemological processes. The natural sciences have created an image of the world in which ghosts, witches and things that go bump in the night are so little valued that they have withered and died in the human imagination. Biology has created a world in which the folk ideas of racial purity can no longer survive. Similarly, the social sciences are creating a world in which national loyalty and the national state can no longer be taken for granted as sacred institutions, in which religion has to change profoundly its views on the nature of man and of sin, in which family loyalty and affection becomes a much more self-conscious and less simple-minded affair, and in which, indeed, all ethical systems are profoundly desacralized.[10]

A kind of scholasticism presently exists in the teaching of civics and government in the schools. Certain "facts," values, attitudes, and beliefs are presumed true. Many believe that the task of the schools is to pass these "truths" on to children and to explain why they are true. Adopting a social science perspective would require that these "truths" be subject to the same criteria for validation as are other claims and assertions. It is easy to understand why some patriotic organizations view the social sciences with suspicion.

Can we take the social sciences seriously? It is true that the social sciences have not yet constructed theories that explain so much as do some theories in the physical and biological sciences. Moreover, it is likely that the subject of man and his society may be the most complex phenomena of all to study. Nevertheless, much is already known that is presently denied to students, much that makes man's political behavior more understandable.

---

[10] Boulding, Kenneth E. "Dare We Take the Social Sciences Seriously?" American Behavioral Scientist. Vol. 10, No. 10 (June, 1967) p. 15.

Should we take the social sciences seriously? Are we willing to tolerate the same relentless search for truth that the physical and biological sciences have succeeded in achieving in the schools? It would mean the end of textbook adoption committees that carefully read each page searching for passages that might offend influential groups of citizens. It would end the practice of textbook publishers and authors submitting to all sorts of censorship in order to secure adoptions, a practice that finds modern "medievalists" kept in line by the lure of profits rather than inquisitions.

Should the schools take the social sciences seriously? Despite the risks, it is unthinkable that the schools could answer, no. As knowledge grows, schools are obligated to bring what is known to the attention of students. A vigorous, free society cannot take refuge in folk descriptions. Moreover, denying Americans who do not go to college political knowledge that is currently available to political and intellectual elites seems to be a violation of the democratic ethic. Social science knowledge exists. While partaking of this knowledge may threaten many of the beliefs held by the folk culture, denying students opportunities to gain this knowledge might place schools in the position of supporting a kind of benevolent despotism.

Finally, if social science creates new problems, they will be ones that folk culture cannot resolve. As Boulding concludes:

> It looks, therefore, as if only the social sciences themselves could solve the problems which they themselves might create,

> which looks suspiciously like the principle that another little drink will cure drunkenness. Until we have drunk deeper of this particular spring, however, the dangers of a little learning may be all too apparent.[11]

Our course in American Political Behavior is an attempt to teach about American politics and government through a social science perspective. If the course is successful, students will perceive politics quite differently than those students who have not studied the course. We hope the course, if successful, will be taken seriously.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 16.